

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 8-10, 12-18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 are pending in this application. Claims 7, 11, 19, and 22 are canceled by the present response without prejudice. Claims 1-4 and 7-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,805,118 to Mishra et al. (herein "Mishra") in view of U.S. patent 6,587,082 to Moore and U.S. patent 6,104,414 to Odryna et al. (herein "Odryna"). Claims 9 and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Mishra in view of Odryna. Claims 10-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Mishra.

Addressing each of the above-noted rejections, each of those rejections is traversed by the present response.

Applicants initially note the claims are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, independent claim 1 now incorporates the limitations of previously pending and now canceled dependent claim 7. Independent claim 9 is amended to also include such limitations. Independent claim 10 now includes the limitations of previously pending and now canceled dependent claim 11. Independent claim 18 now incorporates the limitations of previously pending and now canceled dependent claim 19. Independent claims 20 and 23 now incorporate the limitations of previously pending and now canceled dependent claim 22. The claims as currently written are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

Independent claim 1 recites:

an instruction-input unit that is used by a user to select one of the screen data and one of said image-display devices through a ***graphical user interface (GUI), and to direct the selected image-display device to display the selected screen data***, wherein the transmission data is generated based on the selected screen data by said transmission-data-generating unit,

and then is transmitted to the selected image-display device by said transmission unit. (Emphasis added).

The other independent claims recite a similar feature.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-noted feature clearly distinguishes over the applied art.

With respect to the above-noted feature the Office Action indicates the feature to “select one of the screen data and one of said image-display devices through a graphical user interface (GUI)” is taught by Mishra at column 3, lines 65-67, column 5, lines 25-27, column 6, lines 1-12, and column 6, lines 60-67, and that the claimed feature “to direct the selected image-display device to display the selected screen data” is taught by Mishra at column 9, lines 1-25, and column 10, lines 45-65.¹

Applicants traverse the above-noted position for the rejection and believe that Mishra does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features at the noted portions, in contrast to the position taken in the Office Action.

More particularly, in contrast to the position taken in the Office Action, Mishra does not provide any clear teaching of the type of interface used to select displayed image data when an image set is selected as shown for example in Figure 6H in Mishra. Mishra simply does not teach or suggest that the interface used is a graphical user interface (GUI). Moreover, selecting an image set in Mishra is directed to a single work space, and such a single work space may span beyond a single screen and provide larger logical viewing units (see Mishra at column 4, lines 10-12). In such ways, Mishra does not teach or suggest selecting one of screen data and one of the image-display devices through a graphical user interface (GUI) as recited in the claims, and then further directing the selected image-display device to display the selected screen data.

¹ Office Action of April 21, 2004, page 4, lines 4-9.

Applicants also note that such differences apparently stem from the fact that the device and method in the claims as currently written and the device in Mishra are different devices with different objectives.

One objective in the claims as currently written, and with reference to Figure 2 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, is to allow a central control device 100 to control which of different pages of a document stored in a two-dimensional arrangement 240 are provided to which of respective image display devices 102-1, 102-2, 102-3, etc. Mishra is not directed to any type of similar device. Mishra in Figure 1 discloses one station 22' with plural displays 30-35. However, Mishra does not even address or is concerned about how specific data from a document is provided to those specific displays, particularly with respect to allowing a user to select which specific portions of a document are provided to which of different display devices.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that Mishra does not disclose or suggest the further features now also clarified in the independent claims.

Independent claims 1, 9, 18, 20, and 23 are amended by the present response to include a limitation that a transmission data is area updating data. Such features were recited in previously pending claim 7, and the outstanding Office Action cites to Mishra at column 9, lines 1-25 to disclose such features.²

However, applicants traverse that position for the outstanding rejection. Contrary to the position taken in the Office Action, applicants note that Mishra at column 29, lines 1-25 describes functions provided for a user convenience with respect to viewing images such as an annotation function. Mishra at column 29, lines 1-25 does not provide any description or suggestion with respect to a feature of "area updating data that includes data specifying an

² Office Action of April 21, 2004, page 5, lines 10-14.

updating area of the screen data displayed on an image-display device and data used for updating part of the screen data displayed in the updating area”.

In such ways, amended independent claims 1, 9, 18, 20, and 23 are believed to even further distinguish over the applied art.

Further, independent claim 10 is amended by the present response to incorporate the limitations of now canceled dependent claim 11, to specifically include the limitation that a “user interface displays icons indicating the image-display devices on the primary image-display device”. With respect to that feature the Office Action cites the teachings in Mishra at column 10, lines 43-67.³

Applicants traverse that further basis for the outstanding rejection. That is, contrary to the position taken in the Office Action, applicants note that Mishra at column 10, lines 43-67 is directed to a Pre/Post view in which additional images from previous and following pages can be displayed in miniature, and that portion in Mishra describes how to select such images.

However, applicants note that such a selection in Mishra is made for a Pre/Post view and is not provided for assigning a specific page to a specific image-display device, recited in amended independent claim 10. Further, no description is provided in Mishra whatsoever to teach icons indicating image-display devices.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claim 10 also further distinguishes over Mishra for the reasons noted above.

Moreover, no teachings in the further recited references to Moore and/or Odryna can overcome the above-noted deficiencies in Mishra.


In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that each of independent claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 20, and 23, and the claims dependent therefrom, are allowable over the applied art.

³ Office Action of April 21, 2004, page 14, lines 5-8.

Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
GJM/SNS:sjh

Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

I:\ATTY\SNS\19's\199813\199813US-AF DUE 072104.DOC